



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/551,817

09/30/2005

Ping Lin

CU-4448 RJS

3935

26530 7590 05/06/2009
LADAS & PARRY LLP
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SHARAD K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Remarks

Applicant's arguments filed on 04/07/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Relating to Claim 1:

In view of the fact, that **WIDEGREN** teaches, "Each of the core network service nodes connects to a UMTS Terrestrial Radio Access Network (UTRAN) 24 over a Radio Access Network (RAN) interface e.g. also includes internal nodes." (Widegren, Col.7; 1-40, Col.8; 33-43). Thus, it is evidently, the explanations above are to initiate a radio access bearer service, a request is transmitted to the UTRAN for communication with a mobile radio. One or more parameters accompany the radio access bearer service request. When establishing each bearer, the UTRAN flexibly "maps" or allocates the radio access bearer to physical transport and radio channel resources through the UTRAN and over the radio air interface, respectively. The transport connection between nodes in the UTRAN in a preferred example embodiment is an ATM type connection, that positively, anticipated by **WIDEGREN**. Hence, it is believed that **WIDEGREN** still teaches the claimed limitations.

The above arguments also recites for the other independent claims, consequently the response is the same explanation as set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Because the remaining claims depend directly/indirectly, from one of the independent claims discussed above, as a result the response is the same justification as set forth above.

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the refutation are sustained.

Application/Control Number: 10/551,817
Art Unit: 2617

Page 3

/Sharad Rampuria/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2617